

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/633,592	BIRKELBACH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeffrey Sharp	3677	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jeffrey Sharp.

(3) Flemming Saether.

(2) Robert Katz.

(4) HEINZ BARDEHLE

Date of Interview: 24 October 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: Claims of record.


Identification of prior art discussed: Prior art of record, particularly those cited in Final Office Action mailed 25 May 2005.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


  
**ROBERT J. SANDY**  
 PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

DISCUSSED MINOR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRIOR ART OF RECORD AND APPLICANT'S FIGURE 1. CLARIFIED "TRANSITION" BETWEEN FRONT AND REAR AREA. DISCUSSED POSSIBLE REJECTION UNDER 35 USC §103(a) BIRKELBACH DE 19960287 C1 IN VIEW OF CARLSON ET AL. US-3,794,092. DISCUSSED POSSIBLE AMENDMENT TO CLAIM 15 WHICH MIGHT DEFINE OVER BIRKELBACH & CARLSON ET AL. REFERENCES.



10/24/05



Fleming Sæther